

REMARKS

The Official Action of February 8, 2005, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1-14, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-14 remain in the application for consideration.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that claim 11 would be allowable subject to being rewritten in independent form. In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the primary inventive feature from allowable claim 11 setting out a recessed portion on a side of the top side of the main body wherein the distinctive strip is engaged in the recessed portion and on part of the top side. Clearly, this feature is not taught by the cited prior art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is now allowable and that this application is now in condition for examination.


Appln. No. 10/660,669
Amdt. dated May 2, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Feb. 8, 2005

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\D\dire\Wang155\Pto\Amendment-A.doc